

The Honorable Franklin D. Burgess

BUCKNELL STEHLIK SATO & STUBNER, LLP
2003 Western Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98121
(206) 587-0144 • fax (206) 587-0277

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, AT TACOMA

AT&T CORP. and ALASCOM, INC., d/b/a
AT&T Alascom, Inc.

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DAVID W. WALKER, DONALD J.
SCHROEDER, and TERRY A. GUNSEL,

Defendants.

NO. C04-5709FDB

**MOTION BY TERRENCE J.
DONAHUE TO (1) INTERVENE
AND BE SUBSTITUTED AS REAL
PARTY IN INTEREST FOR
CERTAIN CAUSES OF ACTION,
AND (2) FILE A COMPLAINT IN
INTERVENTION, AMENDING
CERTAIN CAUSES OF ACTION,
ADDING CLAIMS AND
DEFENDANTS**

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
March 17, 2006

I. INTRODUCTION

Terrence J. Donahue, the duly appointed and acting trustee for the Chapter 7 bankruptcy estate of PT Cable, Inc. (hereafter "Trustee" and "PT Cable"), and hereby moves the court for entry of an order: (1) granting the Trustee leave to intervene in this action and substitute in as the real party in interest to prosecute four causes of action asserted herein by the plaintiff, and (2) granting the Trustee leave to amend the causes of action for which the Trustee is substituted as the real party in interest and to assert new claims against both existing and new defendants.

Motion by Terrence J. Donahue to (1) Intervene and be
Substituted as Real Party in Interest, etc. - 1

BUCKNELL STEHLIK SATO & STUBNER, LLP
2003 Western Avenue, Suite 400
Seattle, Washington 98121
(206) 587-0144 • fax (206) 587-0277

1 A. Substitution and Intervention.

2 The Trustee is seeking leave to substitute in as the real party in interest for four causes of
3 action asserted by the existing plaintiffs in this action against the three existing defendants and
4 further, to intervene in this action. The specific causes of action for which the Trustee seeks to
5 substitute in as the real party-in-interest plaintiff are: the Third Claim for Relief (Breach of
6 Fiduciary Duty), the Fifth Claim for Relief (Constructive Fraudulent Conveyances), the Sixth Claim
7 for Relief (Actual Fraudulent Conveyances), and the Eighth Claim for Relief (Illegal
8 Dividends)(hereafter collectively, "Substitution Causes of Action").
9

10 B. Amendment.

11 If permitted to substitute in as a real party in interest, the Trustee requests leave to: 1) amend
12 the Substitution Causes of Action by adding factual allegations and refining applicable legal theories
13 and, 2) add new causes of action and new parties, pursuant to a proposed Complaint in Intervention
14 substantially in form attached to this Motion as Exhibit 1. (Depending on possible negotiations or
15 developments, it is possible the ultimate complaint filed by the Trustee would omit some of the
16 parties identified in Exhibit 1.) The material features of this proposed Complaint in Intervention
17 will be described in greater detail below.
18

19
20 **II. DISCUSSION AND ARGUMENT**

21 A. The Trustee of the PT Cable Chapter 7 estate is the real party in interest to
22 prosecute the third, fifth, sixth and eighth claims for relief asserted by the
23 existing plaintiffs.

24 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 17(a) provides, in pertinent part: "Every action shall be prosecuted in the
25

1 name of the real party in interest."

2 The Substitution Causes of Action include claims for illegal dividend, breach of fiduciary
3 duty, constructive fraudulent conveyance, and actual fraudulent conveyance. Causes of action to
4 recover illegal dividends and for breach of fiduciary duty belonged to the PT Cable corporate entity
5 prior to its Chapter 7 proceeding. They became property of the PT Cable Chapter 7 bankruptcy
6 estate when the Chapter 7 proceeding was initiated, to be administered by the Trustee.¹

8 11 U.S.C. § 541 provides, in pertinent part:

9 The commencement of a case under § 301, 302, or 303 of this title creates an estate.
10 Such estate is comprised of all the following property, wherever located and by
11 whomever held:

12 (1) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c)(2) of this section, all legal or
13 equitable interests of the debtor in property as of the commencement of the case....

14 The meaning of the term "property" as used in § 541(a) is very broad and includes any claim or
15 cause of action that belonged to the debtor. *E.g.*, *Smith v. Arthur Andersen LLP*, 421 F.3d 989, 1002
16 (9th Cir. 2005), *quoting United States v. Whiting Pools, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 198, 205 n.9 (1983).

17 Claims to recover unlawful dividends made by a Delaware corporation belong to the
18 corporation and may be asserted on behalf of the bankruptcy estate by its representative in bank-
19 ruptcy. *E.g.*, *In re Sheffield Steel Corp.*, 320 B.R. 405, 412-13 (Bankr. N.D. Okla. 2004).² A trustee,
20

21 ¹ PT Cable did not file its own bankruptcy case. The PT Cable Chapter 7 proceeding was
22 initiated by the filing an involuntary bankruptcy petition by PT Cable's primary lenders under 11 U.S.C.
§ 303, thereby creating a bankruptcy estate under 11 U.S.C. § 541.

23 ² In *Sheffield Steel*, a cause of action for recovery of unlawful dividends was asserted by the
24 debtor in possession. In a Chapter 11 case, the debtor in possession is the representative of the
25 bankruptcy estate with standing to pursue the estate's claims. A debtor in possession in Chapter 11 has
26 (with limited exceptions not relevant here) the same rights and powers as a trustee. 11 U.S.C. § 1107.
Thus, a cause of action becoming property of a bankruptcy estate is assertable by a trustee or a debtor in
possession depending on whether a trustee has been appointed, and in either event, is to be distinguished

1 as representative of the bankruptcy estate, also has standing to sue officers and directors of the
 2 debtor for breach of fiduciary duty, and other parties for aiding and abetting such breach. *E.g., In re*
 3 *OODC, LLC*, 321 B.R. 128, 143 (Bankr. Del. 2005). There is no doubt that these Substitution
 4 Causes of Action are property of the PT Cable Chapter 7 Estate.
 5

6 Furthermore, 11 U.S.C. § 544(b) expressly provides in relevant part: “[T]he trustee may
 7 avoid any transfer of an interest of the debtor in property or any obligation incurred by the debtor
 8 that is voidable under applicable law by a creditor holding an [allowable] unsecured claim...” It is
 9 well recognized that this statute grants a trustee power to bring fraudulent transfer actions, for the
 10 benefit of the bankruptcy estate, that a creditor holding an allowable claim could have brought under
 11 applicable state law. *E.g., In re International Loan Network, Inc.*, 160 B.R. 1, 17-19 (Bankr. D.D.C.
 12 1993). For the foregoing reasons, it is appropriate to substitute the Trustee as the real party in
 13 interest to prosecute the Substitution Causes of Action.³
 14

15 B. The Trustee should be allowed to intervene, not only to prosecute existing claims as
 16 the real party in interest but for all purposes, including adding parties and causes of
 17 action.

18 Intervention by the Trustee is authorized by Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 24(a), intervention as a matter or
 19 right, and (b), permissive intervention. Those rules provides, in pertinent part,

20 (a) Upon timely application anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action:...(2) when

21 from a cause of action assertable by an individual creditor of the debtor following a bankruptcy petition.
 22

23 ³ By order dated October 17, 2005, this court stayed the prosecution of this action
 24 pursuant to the request of the Trustee in order to allow the Trustee time to determine whether he wished
 25 to intervene in this action. As demonstrated by this motion, the Trustee has determined that intervention
 26 is appropriate.

27 Motion by Terrence J. Donahue to (1) Intervene and be
 28 Substituted as Real Party in Interest, etc. - 4

BUCKNELL STEHLIK SATO & STUBNER, LLP
 2003 Western Avenue, Suite 400
 Seattle, Washington 98121
 (206) 587-0144 • fax (206) 587-0277

1 the applicant claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of
 2 the action and the applicant is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical
 3 matter impair or impede the applicant's ability to protect that interest, unless the applicant's
 4 interest is adequately represented by existing parties.

5 (b) Upon timely application anyone may be permitted to intervene in an action:...(2) when an
 6 applicant's claim or defense and the main action have a question of law or fact in common....
 7 In exercising its discretion the court shall consider whether the intervention will unduly
 8 delay or prejudice the adjudication of the rights of the original parties.

9 Here, intervention is mandated under part (a) because the Trustee has a direct interest in the
 10 property and in the transaction which is the subject of the pending action. Indeed, if as argued above
 11 the Trustee is the real party in interest, by definition the Trustee has an interest in the transaction
 12 which is the subject of the pending case. As to the property involved, the Trustee has a right to
 13 avoid the fraudulent transfers of PT Cable's property to the Lenders and the cash that was transferred
 14 to PT Cable's owners as a dividend. The Trustee's interests in the claims arising out of the illegal
 15 dividend transaction cannot be adequately protected unless the Trustee is allowed to pursue those
 16 claims for the benefit of all creditors, not merely the benefit of the original plaintiff herein. The
 17 Trustee should not be made to rely on others to prosecute claims that belong to the PT Cable
 18 Chapter 7 bankruptcy estate– indeed others do not (absent leave of the bankruptcy court) have
 19 standing to prosecute those actions belonging to the estate.

20 Intervention is also permitted under part (b) because the Trustee's claims, whether prosecuted
 21 as a substituted party or otherwise, share at least some common factual questions.⁴

22 ⁴ Although not all central factual issues, such as PT Cable's solvency, are issues common to the
 23 claims the Trustee intends to pursue and the claims that would remain with the existing plaintiffs if the
 24 Trustee is allowed to intervene, it remains clear that at least the background facts, such as the formation
 25 of the contracts with PT Cable's customers and the propriety of charging a profit for operations and
 26 maintenance, are facts that both the plaintiffs and the Trustee will want to prove, either through the
 27 introduction of evidence, collateral estoppel or other means.

As required by Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 24(c), a proposed Complaint in Intervention, attached as "Exhibit 1" to this motion, is submitted herewith. The Trustee reserves all rights to add or delete parties prior to finalizing and filing the complaint, but only to the extent doing so is consistent with and within the scope of relief granted to the Trustee pursuant to this or another motion.

In summary, should the court permit the Trustee to substitute in as a real party in interest, the court should, quite naturally, also permit the Trustee to intervene.

C. The Trustee should be allowed to make minor amendments to the Substitution Causes of Action and add additional claims and parties.

As a natural adjunct to substituting in as the real party in interest for the Substitution Causes of Action, the Trustee wishes to amend those causes of action in a relatively minor fashion by making additional factual averments and adding additional parties not named by the original plaintiff herein. In addition, the Trustee wishes to add several new causes of action against additional defendants. The proposed Complaint in Intervention, Exhibit 1 to this motion, sets out the actual proposed amended averments, causes of action and additional defendants. By way of summary, the material new features of the Complaint in Intervention are summarized below.

1. Add additional defendants to the Eighth Claim for Relief (Illegal Dividends), including all individual directors who voted to approve the challenged dividends and/or the dividend loan transaction which made the dividends possible (adding Brooke Coburn, William E. Conway, Jr.; Richard G. Darman, and Peter H. Sorensen, all of whom were directors of PT Cable or its former parent, Neptune Pacific Holdings, Inc. (now merged into PT Cable), as well as various entity defendants alleged to have received a portion of the illegal dividends;

2. Add the same additional individual defendants to the Third Claim for Relief (Breach of Fiduciary Duty);

3. Consolidate the Fifth and Sixth Claims for Relief for constructive and actual fraudulent transfers into one cause of action for fraudulent transfers and add numerous additional parties

as defendants to this cause of action, specifically, (a) the lenders who loaned PT Cable the money which was used virtually exclusively to pay the illegal dividend, or their successors in interest (New York Life Insurance Company, New York Life Insurance and Annuity Corporation, Jefferson-Pilot Financial Insurance Company, and Jefferson-Pilot Life Insurance Company)(collectively, "Lenders") and who received a security interest in PT Cable's assets and received numerous loan payments from PT Cable, and (b) all of the transferees of and persons benefited by the illegal dividend. This latter group of defendants consist mainly of the "Carlyle Group" affiliated entities which either directly or indirectly owned and controlled PT Cable or one or more of its directors, or benefited in some fashion from the illegal dividend.

4. Add two "aiding and abetting" causes of action, one for aiding and abetting PT Cable's and its corporate parent's directors' breach of fiduciary duty, and another for aiding and abetting the illegal dividend. The additional defendants for these aiding a abetting causes of action are the so called "Carlyle Group" affiliated entities and all persons who controlled, directly or indirectly, the actions of PT Cable or the actions of its corporate parents; Neptune Communications, LLC and Neptune Global Systems, LLC, and the Lenders who lent money to PT Cable for the express purpose of being paid out to PT Cable's owners as a dividend.

5. Add an "alter ego" cause of action requesting disregard of entities used as instrumentalities to perpetrate a fraud or injustice upon PT Cable, Neptune Pacific and/or their creditors.

This court is undoubtedly well aware of the liberal standards that apply to requests to amend pleadings. Under the language of the appropriate rule, Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 15, amendment shall be freely given when justice so requires. The Trustee, if allowed to substitute in and intervene as a new party plaintiff, should be permitted to plead his claims and sue the appropriate and necessary parties as his judgment dictates.

The new claims all arise out of the same common facts and circumstances as do the Substitution Causes of Action and the other causes of action asserted by the existing plaintiffs. The Trustee is not seeking to add new claims based on new or different facts or circumstances.

The Trustee is, of course, free to bring new claims in a separate cause of action. However, the court may very well consolidate a new action with this case due to the commonality of operative

1 facts and the result would be that same as permitting substitution, intervention and amendment at
2 this juncture.⁵

3
4 The defendants cannot demonstrate that they would suffer material prejudice if the court
5 allowed the Trustee to amend as requested. Clearly, it promotes judicial economy and fairness to all
6 of the ultimate litigants that all of the claims arising out of the same facts and circumstances be
7 brought and fully and finally litigated in one action. The relevant factors weigh heavily in favor of
8 granting the Trustee's motion to amend.

9 10 **III. CONCLUSION**

11 For reasons stated, the Trustee requests that the Court grant this Motion.

12 Respectfully submitted this 24th day of February, 2006.

13
14 **BUCKNELL STEHLIK SATO & STUBNER, LLP**

15 /s/ Edwin K. Sato, WSBA # 13633
16 Bucknell Stehlik Sato & Stubner, LLP
17 2003 Western Avenue, Suite 400
18 Seattle, WA 98121
19 Telephone: (206) 587-0144
20 Fax: (206) 587-0277
21 E-mail: esato@bsss-law.com

22
23 _____
24 Thomas N. Bucknell, WSBA # 1587
25 Jerry N. Stehlik, WSBA #13050
26 Edwin K. Sato, WSBA # 13633
27 of Attorneys for Trustee

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

⁵ The Trustee reserves his rights to seek a severance of his claims for trial under Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 20(b) and 42(b). The Trustee cannot full assess the pros and cons of being a co-plaintiff along with the existing plaintiffs until he becomes fully ensconced in the case and, therefore, even though intervention in this action appears reasonable now, it is conceivable that severing claims may prove to be prudent.